

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 have been rejected as obvious over Owechko (US 6,801,662) in view of Tsai (US 2002/0076088). This rejection is incorrect for two reasons.

First, in Tsai, the sub-images are the *same* spatial region (the whole face), but are different resolutions and have different filters applied. Even at different resolutions and with different filters applied, the images are of the same area of the same face. They are not of “different spatial regions.” Therefore, even if Owechko were modified in light of Tsai, the claimed invention would not be achieved.

Second, there is no motivation for modifying the Owechko system in light of Tsai. Tsai breaks an image of a face into sub-images of varying resolutions and different filters (channels) for the purpose of identifying the person from a large database of faces. The breakdown of the facial image into lower-resolution images and different filters is for the purpose of reducing the amount of computation that is required. In other words, the system first tries to identify the face using the lower-resolution images, which require less computation time. If the lower-resolution images are insufficient to identify the face, the next higher resolution images are used. However, in an occupant classification system, such as Owechko, the face of the occupant is unimportant and there is no need to individually identify occupant, but only to classify the occupant. Thus, the computation burden is much lower. Nor is there any indication that lower-resolution sub-images or sub-images of different channels would be useful for occupant classification. Therefore, there is no motivation for modifying Owechko to use the Tsai technique.

The proposed motivation is insufficient. The proposed motivation is “properly deploying the safety airbag system according to the size of the occupant,” but this is already done by Owechko. This is not motivation to modify Owechko in view of Tsai. There is no indication that any changes to Owechko based upon anything taught by Tsai would be beneficial.

If any fees or extensions are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C. for any additional fees. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

/John E. Carlson/
John E. Carlson
Registration No. 37,794
400 W. Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: August 30, 2006